

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS P.O. Box 1456 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/760,074	09/760,074 01/12/2001		Srinivas S. Rao	1-20306	3376
4859	7590	05/27/2003			
MACMILLAN SOBANSKI & TODD, LLC ONE MARITIME PLAZA FOURTH FLOOR				EXAMINER	
720 WATER	STREET	•	LIN, KUANG Y		
roccio, o	LEDO, OH 43604-1619			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				1725	

DATE MAILED: 05/27/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office And	09/760,074	RAO ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
The MALLING CO.	Kuang Y. Lin	1725					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 M	<i>lay 2003</i> .						
	s action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims							
4) Claim(s) 1,2,5-7,10,13 and 16-27 is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,2,5-7,10,13 and 16-27</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.							
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.							
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action. 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120							
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).							
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:							
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
		- N-					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application)							
a) 🔲 The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received							
15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121. Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (RTO 200)							
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)							
S. Patent and Trademark Office TO-326 (Rev. 04-01) Office Action Summary							

Application/Control Number: 09/760,074 Page 2

Art Unit: 1725

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 3. Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 10, and 13, 16-27 are again rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combined teaching of Germany 3,619,525 and applicants' admitted prior art as set forth in pages 1-2 of the specification.

Germany '525 shows to use a low pressure casting process for casting motor vehicle wheel. The process includes application of vibration to the casting mold during the solidification process of the molten metal. In short Germany '525 substantially shows the invention as claimed except that it does not show the structure of the casting mold. The admitted prior art shows that it is conventional to gravity cast or pressure cast a vehicle wheel with multi-segment mold to

Art Unit: 1725

facilitate the casting removal step after the casting solidified. In short, the admitted prior art substantially shows the invention as claimed except that it does not show to use a vibrator. In view of the prior art teachings as a whole, it would have been obvious to use the conventional multi-segment mold in the process of Germany '525 to facilitate the casting removal. It would also have been obvious to vibrate the mold of the admitted prior art to refine the grain in view of Germany '525. Although Germany '535 did not disclose the type and location of the vibrator, it would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill to use an appropriate type of the vibrator to place the same at an appropriate location of the mold in the process of Germany. Further, it would also have been obvious to obtain the optimal timing of vibration through routine experimentation.

4. Applicant's arguments filed May 16, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants' main argument is in that the German '525 reference to Bendig is directed toward low pressure casting machines and does not shows or suggests gravity casting of wheels. They concluded that there is no motivation to apply the vibration of a low pressure casting machine to a gravity casting apparatus. However, in col. 3, lines 17-28 of German '525 it discloses that during the solidification stage, the mold is vibrated, preferably at between 15,000 and 25,000 Hz such that to obtain a cast product of dense structure. Thus, it would have been obvious to vibrate the conventional gravity casting mold to obtain a dense cast structure in view of the advantage.

Application/Control Number: 09/760,074 Page 4

Art Unit: 1725

All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the application prior to the 5. entry of the submission under 37 CFR 1.114 and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the application prior to entry under 37 CFR 1.114. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL even though it is a first action after the filing of a request for continued examination and the submission under 37 CFR 1.114. See MPEP§706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the 6. examiner should be directed to Kuang Y. Lin whose telephone number is 703-308-2322. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 10:00-6:30,.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas X Dunn can be reached on 703-308-3318. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Application/Control Number: 09/760,074

Art Unit: 1725

Page 5

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

May 23, 2003

KUANG Y. LIN

EXAMINER GROUP 320

1725